

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated January 4, 2011 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 13, 14 and 18-25 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-10, 13-14 and 18-25 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0063732 by Mansikkaniemi et al. (hereinafter “Mansikkaniemi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,171,448 to Danielson et al. (hereinafter “Danielson”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. The combination of Mansikkaniemi and Danielson at least fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. For example, independent claim 1 recites detecting a text pattern in one or more calendar notes, associating the one or more calendar notes with one or more calendar profiles in a terminal on the basis of the detected text pattern, and generating the calendar content to be shared on the basis of at least one selected calendar profile. Independent claims 5, 10, and 14 recite similar features. Applicants submit the combination of Mansikkaniemi and Danielson at least fails to teach or suggest this use of detected text patterns.

In the Office Action (e.g., page 4) Danielson’s Summary of the Invention at col. 2, lines 5-30 is cited as allegedly showing “detecting a text pattern in the one or more calendar notes” and “on the basis of the detected text patterns, each calendar profile defining a unique view to the calendar entries.” However, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Danielson, as well as the Danielson reference as a whole, fails to teach or suggest a calendar profile (or any equivalent thereof) that affects viewability of a calendar note that is defined based on a text pattern detected from the calendar note itself.

The cited portion of Danielson relates to a “client user interface including at least one activity data field [that]...includes descriptive text and an activity start time.” Background data relevant to the activity data is acquired by “obtaining a descriptive text when the start time is within a predetermined period; parsing and pattern matching the descriptive text to identify searchable components of the descriptive text; querying a plurality of sources across a network to obtain the background information; and storing the background information that is retrieved

in response to querying the plurality of sources.” This additional information is “presented using the client user interface” when “selection of a particular activity data field from a user is received,” and the “user is then allowed to input meeting data concerning the selected activity data field...[and] a plurality of participant users are allowed access to the stored meeting data via the network.”

Danielson describes parsing background text that is used in enhancing data that describes activities of a meeting, but nowhere is this taught or suggested as being used with profiles or any equivalent that changes how or whether data may be viewed. The “background information” cited in Danielson’s Summary of the Invention is described, e.g. at column 20, lines 7-37, as being used to update “the calendaring system and eventually the user with the best information it can gather to prepare the user for the target meeting.” As far as accessing the “stored meeting data,” Danielson describes the users making that decision, not the background information placed in the meeting data. For example, “a session report is generated based on the activity data and the meeting data” and a user may “select what will be included in the session report, such as a list of the session activities, a list of the session participants, and a list of the people invited but not participating in the session,” after which “a user may easily create session reports and distribute the reports to desired individuals.” (Danielson, col. 18, lines 37-38 and 64-67, and col. 19, lines 1-5).

Therefore, Danielson is describing the parsing of the descriptive text in order to find additional information about the target event to better prepare the participants. There is no teaching or suggestion that the information is used in determining profiles that are used as the basis for sharing calendar content. Also, as is stated on page 4 of the Office Action, this is also not taught or suggested in Mansikkaniemi. For this reason, the combination of Mansikkaniemi and Danielson fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, and therefore independent claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

Dependent claims 4, 8, 9, 13, and 18-25 are also allowable at least because of their respective dependence from claims 1, 5, 10, and 14, and the arguments given above. In addition, Applicants provide additional reasons why at least claims 20, 21, 24, and 25. Claims 20 and 24 recite obscuring the calendar notes associated with the shared content while retaining indicators of the times of the events associated with the obscured calendar notes. Page 6 of the

Office Action alleges that paragraph 0048 of Mansikkaniemi teaches “any member of the family can look at and add to the family calendar and also look at and add to their private calendar, but cannot look at and add to another’s calendar.” However, this at most suggests that a calendar entry can be seen or not seen (e.g., “cannot look at and add to”), but does not describe that some information such as calendar notes are obscured with other data such as indicators of events times are retained. Therefore claims 20 and 24 are allowable for this additional reason.

Similarly, claims 21 and 25 describe “providing a modified note to describe user availability in the context of both the calendar profile and on the basis of times of day associated with the calendar entries.” Page 7 of the Office Action alleges that paragraph 0046 of Mansikkaniemi teaches the “user is able to create and edit events in the same views of the system where the information is presented” which includes “changing the times and days of events.” However, this describes how a user can change an event in the same user interface view where the calendar events are shown, e.g., without having to enter another user interface screen/view. This says nothing about how the data may be viewed differently by others based on a selected calendar profile. Therefore claims 21 and 25 are allowable for this additional reason.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (IHN.080.WUS) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8500 Normandale Lake Blvd., Suite 320
Minneapolis, MN 55437
952.854.2700

Date: March 30, 2011

By: /William B. Ashley/

William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51,419